

ASDO NEPA DOCUMENT ROUTING SHEET

NEPA Document Number: **DOI-BLM-AZ-A010-2011-0003-CX**

Project Title: **Wells Allotment Grazing Permit Transfer**

Project Lead: Jacquilyn Roaque

Date that any scoping meeting was conducted: N/A

Date that concurrent, electronic distribution for review was initiated: December 13th, 2010

Deadline for receipt of responses: January 10th, 2011

ID Team/Required Reviewers will be determined at scoping meeting or as a default the following:

Gloria Benson, Tribal Liaison
Diana Hawks, Recreation/Wilderness/VRM
Rody Cox (acting), Lands/Realty/Minerals
Lorraine Christian (acting), Wildlife/ T&E Wildlife
John Herron, Cultural
Lee Hughes, Special Status Plants
Ray Klein, GCPNM Supervisory Ranger
Linda Price, S&G
Whit Bunting, Range/Vegetation, Weeds
Richard Spotts, Environmental Coordinator
John Sims, Supervisory Law Enforcement

Relevant Manager(s):
Lorraine Christian ASFO

Required Recipients of electronic distribution E-mails only (not reminders):

Andi Rogers (E-mail address: arogers@azgfd.gov)
Sarah Reif (E-mail address: serif@azgfd.gov)
LeAnn Skrzynski (E-mail address: lskrzynski@kaibabpaiute-nsn.gov)

(Ms. Rogers and Ms. Reif are Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) habitat specialists. Ms. Skrzynski is Environmental Program Director for the Kaibab Paiute Tribe (KPT). They may review and/or forward on ASDO NEPA documents to other employees. If a Project Lead receives comments from any AGFD employee on their draft NEPA document, they should include them in the complete set/administrative record and share them with Kittie Jensen as the ASDO Wildlife Team Lead. Ms. Jensen will then recommend how these comments should be addressed. If a Project Lead receives comments from any KPT employee, they should include them in the complete set/administrative and share them with Gloria Benson as the ASDO Tribal Liaison. Ms. Benson will then recommend how these comments should be addressed.)

NEPA Document Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-A010-2011-0003-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Arizona Strip Field Office

Allotment Number: #05208

Proposed Action Title/Type: Wells Allotment Grazing Permit Transfer

Location of Proposed Action: The Wells Allotment is located approximately 35 miles east southeast of St. George, Utah. All public lands within the allotment are entirely located within the Lost Spring Gap ACEC. The allotment is found within the following described area of the Arizona Strip Field Office (Attachment 2):

Gila & Salt River Meridian, Mohave County, Arizona

T. 42 N., R. 8 W.,
Section 35 and 36
T. 42 N., R. 7 W.,
Section 31
T. 41 N., R. 8 W.,
Section 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22
T. 41 N., R 7 W.,
Section 6 and 7

Description of Proposed Action: This transfer of base water and attached grazing preference from Gilbert Reeve to Reeve Livestock LLC applies to the Wells Allotment. The attached preference of this allotment is described below:

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Livestock</u>	<u>Season of Use</u>	<u>%PL*</u>	<u>AUMs</u>
Wells	32	Cattle	03/01 – 02/28	80	307
Wells	1	Cattle	03/01 – 06/30	80	3

*PL = Public Land

There are no changes to the grazing preference or terms and conditions of the permit. The permit resulting from this transfer would be effective for the same period of time as the current permit, which is valid through February 28, 2011.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Arizona Strip Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved: January 29, 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the following RMP decisions:

LA-GM-01, which states, “All allotments will continue to be classified as available for grazing by livestock under the principle of multiple use and sustained yield, except where specifically noted....” Wells Allotment is classified as available for grazing by livestock under this decision.

MA-AC-01(PS), which states, “Proposed actions within the ACEC will be evaluated to ensure they do not adversely impact cultural resources. ...” Per the CRPR dated December 14, 2010, the nature of the proposed action is such that no impact can be expected on significant cultural resources.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, Appendix 5.4: D. (1) Approval of transfers of grazing preference.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM2 apply, see Attachment 1.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: /s/ Lorraine M. Christian Date: 1/27/11
(Signature)

Name: Lorraine M. Christian
Title: Arizona Strip Field Office Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Jacquilyn Roaque
Rangeland Management Specialist
BLM, Arizona Strip Field Office
345 East Riverside Drive
St. George, Utah 84790
(435)688-3242

Attachment 1

EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES REVIEW AND CHECKLIST		
<p>IMPORTANT: Appropriate staff should review the circumstances listed below, and comment for concurrence. Rationale supporting the concurrence should be included where appropriate.</p>		
EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES	YES/NO & RATIONALE (If - Appropriate)	STAFF
Does the proposed action...		
1. Have significant impacts on public health and safety?	No	JRoaque
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	JHerron DHawks LChristian
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?	No	JRoaque
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	JRoaque
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	JRoaque
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	JRoaque
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?	No	JHerron

8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	LChristian LHughes
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	JRoaque
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?	No	JRoaque
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?	No	GBenson
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	WBunting

Attachment 2



